

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-10, 11-15, 17-22 are now pending in the application.

Applicant has thoroughly reviewed the outstanding Office Action including the Examiner's remarks and the references cited therein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the remarks contained herein.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 7-10, 12-14, 19 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Kawa et al.* (JP 2002-297309 A) in view of *Gettemy et al.* (US 7,348,964 B1). These rejections are respectfully traversed. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no motivation or reason to combine *Kawa et al.* and *Gettemy et al.* to arrive at the present invention.

Independent Claims 1 and 10 of the present application recite a notebook computer with a hidden touch pad, comprising: a main portion including a housing, wherein the housing has a first surface and a second surface, a receiving portion formed in the second surface and not exposed to the first surface, and a thickness of the housing that the receiving portion forms therein is thinner than that of the housing that the receiving portion does not form therein; a display connected to the main portion in a rotatable manner; and a touch pad disposed onto the receiving portion; wherein the housing prevents the touch pad from being exposed to an atmosphere outside of the housing. See, e.g., Paragraph 32, 33 and Figure 2d.

The Office Action states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the teaching of *Gettemy et al.* in the notebook computer taught by *Kawa et al.* Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The present invention provides a thickness of the housing that the receiving portion forms therein is thinner than that of the housing except the receiving portion. That means the present invention has a "concave portion" defined in the housing. This allows not only an adequate structure strength of the housing but also a **good sensitivity of the touch pad**, while keeping the touch pad unexposed from the housing simultaneously. The Office Action states that *Gettemy et al.* also provides the same feature, however, Applicant respectfully submits that *Kawa et al.* cannot be combined with *Gettemy et al.* to add above said feature for following reasons:

1. Given the trend for notebooks to be made with a light and thin structure, the present invention provides a "notebook computer with hidden touch pad" having a housing with concaved portion to receive a touch pad to reduce the thickness of the whole structure. *Kawa et al.* does provide an "unholed" housing that covers the touch pad, but however, provides no concaved structure to reduce the whole thickness, and moreover, to **increase the sensitivity of the touch pad**. Note especially that *Kawa et al.* points out "if the track pad is a capacitance type, even the common surface layer 54 is thick, the detection is also performed. If the track pad is pressure type, the **track pad 53 must be thin** and deforms by pressing" [0025], meaning that a concaved structure is not disclosed in *Kawa et al.*.

Said problems such as “too thick a notebook computer” or “insufficient sensitivity of the touch pad” do not occur immediately to the skilled person in the art and are not obvious in view of the prior art. However, the subject matter of present claim 1 solves this complex of problems and consequently present claim 1 is not obvious.

Although the Office Action recites that *“Figure 3 shows the housing 340, where the internal surface is shown to be thinner where the touch-screen 350 is disposed than at other parts of the housing”* Gettemy et al., however, fails to provide a reason, or any motivation or suggestion or expectation of success to resolve said problems. Gettemy et al. neither teaches that a thinner structure being made is for reducing the whole thickness nor for increasing the sensitivity of pressure sensor 330. More particularly, Gettemy et al. recites that the outer film 230 or the front cover assembly may have holes or indentations for buttons or to indicate button or other like functions, which is definitely in conflict with the concept of the present invention or even Kawa et al.

Therefore, there is absolutely no hint for a possible combination of Kawa et al. and Gettemy et al. and the skilled person in the art would not get any advantageous technical teaching from the disclosure of Gettemy et al.

2. Gettemy et al. teaches away from Kawa et al. Gettemy et al. teaches that a user will apply pressure to outer film 230 to indicate a particular position on display mechanism 250 that will input a command to device 200. The pressure sensors 260 beneath display mechanism 250 will be able to register where that position is by measuring the force exerted upon each sensor. At least three sensors may be used, and a method such as triangulation will compare the relative forces exerted and register

where on display device 250 the pressure is exerted. See *column 5 lines 22-30*. In other words, the display mechanism 250 is only used to sense a particular position, but not to control a cursor. Evidently, the display mechanism 250 is not a touch pad. Therefore, the display mechanism 250 disclosed in *Gettemy et al.* is totally different from the coordinate input device disclosed in *Kawa et al.*

Therefore, the skilled person would not even consider combining *Kawa et al.* and *Gettemy et al.*.

3. *Gettemy et al.* teaches a "cover" to receive the touch pad, not a housing, a person who is skilled in the art may find it unobvious to make such a modification in a housing of a notebook. Thus, there is still a lack of a reason, or any motivation or suggestion, to combine *Kawa et al.* with *Gettemy et al.*.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that a skilled person would not have been motivated or have had a reason to employ the structure of *Gettemy et al.* in the housing of *Kawa et al.* for the purpose of resolving problems like "too thick a notebook computer" or "insufficient sensitivity of the touch pad".

Therefore, independent Claims 1 and 10 are patentable over the cited references and in condition for allowance. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 7-9, 12-14, 19 and 21, which ultimately depend from claims 1 and 10, are likewise patentable and in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is, therefore, respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a conference would help to expedite the prosecution of the application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

No remittance is believed due, Should any fee be required, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 18-0002, and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,



Alun L. Palmer – Reg. No. 47,838
RABIN & BERDO, PC – Cust. No. 23995
Facsimile: 202-408-0924
Telephone: 202-371-8976

April 29, 2009
Date

ALP/